

# The Myth of Deification of Alexander and Its Alleged Influence on the Cult of Skanda / Muruga / Karttikeya

K. V. Ramakrishna Rao, B.Sc., M.A., A.M.I.E., C.Eng(I), B.L.,

**Introduction:** The British historians, who collaborated with the East Indian Company Rulers, have decided to fix the invasion of Alexander as a sheet anchor of Indian history<sup>1</sup>. They decided that before 327 BCE, no incident of India could be considered historical<sup>2</sup>. They wrote that the advancements of Indian arts and sciences were also only outcome of Alexander's invasion and adapted and adopted from the Greeks<sup>3</sup>. The alleged intrusion of Alexander myth in the Hindu pantheon is one of such suggestions. Indian scholars immediately pointed out the fallacies involved in such hypotheses put forward<sup>4</sup>. However, as some scholars<sup>5</sup> have tried to resurrect such myth recently, the background is critically analyzed in the context. As it delves around the Greek source materials and accounts, they are examined minutely first.

**The Greek Accounts and Histories:** As popularly believed the source materials for Alexander (c.October 356 BCE to June 13, 323 ) is scanty and much of his history has been written based on fables and secondary sources of later period. Scholars have pointed out this

fact. While discussing about the "*Records of Alexander*", Greene<sup>6</sup> notes that, "...the really authentic records are so scanty". There are no contemporary authorities for the history of Alexander. All written so-called histories are based on secondary or even third sources of much later period. The western historians have depended upon Arrian (c.90-170 or 96-160 CE)'s *Anabasis of Alexander*, Quintus Curtius (date uncertain, though western scholars assign 1<sup>st</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> centuries of CE), Plutarch (c.46-100 CE), Justin (c.2<sup>nd</sup> century of CE) and Diodorus (c.first century of CE), *who all have made use of earlier writers whose works are reportedly lost or not available, i.e., the sources are unauthentic and unverifiable*. And the writings of them do not agree with any matter, as published and pointed out by the westerners themselves. There have been hundreds of legends and fables about "Alexander". After loosing all secondary-secondary sources, how the sketchy details transformed into history is seen from the books published by the western scholars:

Sl. No.	Author	Name of the book	Year of publication	Remarks
1.	Schwanbeck, German	Indika	1846	Though Indika is attributed to the authorship of Megasthenes, who supposedly visited the Court of Chandragupta, his work is not found, as it was lost 2000 years back. The reconstructed or produced work is of recent origin.
2.	Mc Crindle	Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian	1877	It is again a compilation of scrap writings obtained from the different secondary sources.
3.	Mc Crindle	The Invasion of India by Alexander the Great	1893	It is a compilation of scrap writings obtained from the different secondary sources to prove that Alexander invaded India.
4.	Hogarth, David George	Philip and Alexander of Macedon	1897	He discussed the deification of Alexander, but, noted that it was "Misplaced ingenuity."
5.	B. I. Wheeler	Alexander the Great	1900	Ammon - as the deified son of the god; dialogue with the Gymnosophists

The origin of the word Skanda in Sanskrit literature and Kanda in Tamil literature is discussed.

**The Word Skanda:** The word *Skanda* (Sanskrit) is derived from *skand* with different meanings as tabulated below:

Atmanepada	Prasmaipada	Noun
1. to jump	1. to leap, jump	1. leaping
2. to raise	2. to raise, ascend, jump upwards	2. quicksilver
3. to pour out	3. to fall, drop	3. Noun of Karttikeya
4. to emit	4. to burst or leap out	4. Noun of Shiva
	5. to perish, come to an end	5. The body
	6. to be spilled, ooze	6. A king
	7. to emit	7. The bank of a river
	8. to emit, neglect, pass by	8. A clever man
	9. to attack, assail, strom	



The word *skanda* is found in the Vedic literature (c.2500-2000 BCE), particularly, Chandayoga Upanishad, is datable to 7<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> centuries BCE. Therefore, the intrusion of skanda myth into India cannot be linked with Alexander. Even the Avestan word *skando* connoting

destruction proves its prevalence during the material period i.e. 1000 BCE. The word *kandu* is found in Tolkappiyam (c.1000 – 500 BCE or 1<sup>st</sup>–2<sup>nd</sup> centuries of CE) and Sangam literature. They have the following meanings:

SL.No	Word	Meaning
1	Kattuttari	bondage or tying; a pillar or post to which an animal is tied.
2	Patrukkodu	Walking staff, support, dependence, defence.
3	Deivamuraintari	A pillar / stake / post, where God resides

The various forms of Kandu, Kanda, Kandazhi, Kadamban etc are discussed in a separate paper. They prove that the worship is indigenous.

The Puranas explain the origin of Skanda as follows:

1. As he conquered demons, he was named *Skanda* (Brahmanda Purana.P.I, III.10-43).
2. As the six bodies born separately joined together as one God, he was known as *skanna*, and thus, Skanda (Brahmanda Purana.P.I, III.10.40-51).
3. He was born from the dissipated (*skanna*) energy of Siva, so the name Skanda was given to him (Vamana Purana.57.3).
4. Skanda has a meaning "attacker", this is similar to *anangu / takkanangu* of Tamil literature.

Therefore, whether the name *Alexander* connotes such shades of meaning is analyzed.

**Alexander, the name:** The writers of Alexander have been silent about the origin of it. Though dictionaries mention different forms of Alexander - alixandre, alisaundre, alysaunder, allisunder, alysunder, alesunder, alessundere, etc., they do not explain how they originate. In fact, such forms are reportedly found in the books written about the *Romance of Alexander*. After that the word *Alexander* is derived from *Alexandrine* or *Alexandrin* means of doubtful origin. Alexander was in fact not the First one, but the Third ruler of Macedonia. Alexander I (c.507-463 BCE) and Alexander II (c.369-367 BCE) were there earlier ruling Macedonia. In fact, Alexander had a son called Alexander. Even the historians and epigraphists have not been specific about the meaning. In the Indian context, they have made many guess work without any evidences, as the Greek writers mention words *Alexandrum*, *Androcottus*, *Androcottos*, *Xandrames*, *Angrammes*, *Ganderatai* and so on similar to each other.

1. The myth of "*Chandragupta*" meeting "*Alexander*" started with Plutarch, who refers to a meeting between "*Alexandrum*" and "*Androcottos*".
2. Justin reads "*Nandrum*" in the place of "*Alexandrum*".
3. "*Androcottos*" can be anybody, as andro = male, prefix is common in Greek, e.g. Andromeda etc.

4. Curtius refers to one "*Agrammes*" as "the present King" ruling at Palibothra / Pataliputra etc., which scholars identify as Nanda or Chandragupta.
5. Diodorus refers to one "*Xandrames*" as "the present King" ruling at Palibothra / Pataliputra etc., which scholars identify as Nanda or Chandragupta.
6. Plutarch refers to another King "*Gandaritis*" ruling India.
7. Chandragupta is also identified or equated with different expressions - *Sandrakoptas*, *Sandracottas*, *Andracottas*, *Androcottus*, *Chandrai*, *Pradamsana*, *Vrishla*, *Xandrames*.

Again about the word *Alikasundara* as found in the Asokan Rock Edict No.XIII, the western scholars are not anonymous:

1. Fleet<sup>7</sup> and others identify him as Alexander of Corinth (c.252-244 BCE).
2. Buhler<sup>8</sup> identifies with Alexander of Epirus, who died between 262 and 258 BCE relying upon Lassen.

AP.Dascalakis<sup>9</sup>, a professor of University of Athens opines that *the names like Alexandros.....are purely Greek, and at the same time points out that certain names including Alexandros are obviously borrowed from pre-Greek mythology.*

Therefore, whom exactly, the words Alexander and its forms referred to are still in doubt and not final. All these go to prove that the Greek classical accounts compiled from different secondary sources and available today not at all reliable. Incidentally, an important point arises here is the famous of Chandragupta among the Greek writers. It is not known as to why so much of importance is given to him, that too, when he was a child or boy, when Alexander was reportedly on the banks of Hydaspes or Acesines very far away from Magadha!.

**The Birth and Death of Alexander:** The birth of Alexander is shrouded with mystery and legends. He was born in a night to Olympias, the daughter of Neoptolemus, prince of the Molossi, the great temple of the Asian Goddess at Ephesus was burned down. She was fierce and beautiful<sup>10</sup>! His father, Philip divorced Olympias and married Cleopatra, thus Alexander was



estranged from him and his legitimacy was suspected. Later Olympias murdered Philip elevating Alexander to an advantageous position. Other versions accuse Alexander of patricide.

How Alexander died is mystery, though, historians asserted that he was died of a *mysterious disease*, after the conquest of *India*! When he was dying, Peucestas and some others of the Companions passed the night in the temple of Serapis and asked the god whether they should convey the sick man into the temple, if haply he might be cured there by divine help, but a voice warned them not to bring him, but to let him remain where he lay! Bury<sup>11</sup> characteristically notes that, "*such is the punctilious and authentic account of in the Court diary; but it is not sufficient to enable us to discover the precise nature of the fatal disease.*" These details are discussed to show that they have no similarity with that of Skanda archetype or Skanda form of worship.

**Deification of Alexander:** Mahaffy and Wilamowitz-Mollendorff<sup>12</sup> discuss about the myth of development of deification of Alexander into a God. It is said that Alexander himself demanded the Greeks he should be recognized as a God, but Sparta did not accept<sup>13</sup>.

Here, the deification of Alexander during Alexander and thereafter and that is allegedly related to the romance are totally different. The myth of Alexander related to the middle east is accordingly noted clearly. The first is restricted to Greece, Egypt and near areas to them and vanished with the works of romance. The second is the creation of Muslim invaders, who were inspired by Alexander and even assumed the title of Alexander and its origin.

In the case of worship of Skanda and other forms, there is no such contradictions or opposition.

**The Alexander's Invasion of India:** Encyclopedias<sup>14</sup> have been cautious in narrating about the Alexander's invasion of India, because, he never reached India proper. They never record that he conquered India, though they mention about his invasion of India. In fact, there has been a tradition that the Indian forces defeated him and he was forced to retreat.

*"In the battle of Jhelum a large majority of Alexander's cavalry was killed. Alexander realized that if he were to continue fighting he would be completely ruined. He, therefore, requested Porus to stop fighting. Treya to Indian tradition Porus did not kill the surrendered enemy. After this both signed a treaty. Alexander then helped him in annexing othere territories to his kingdom"*<sup>15</sup>.

Recently, a project on Alexander after working extensively, created a website, which points out the following facts:

1. Alexander's ideas concerning India were *...still sketchy in the extreme.*
2. To the Greeks, the land across the Indus was a shallow peninsula, bounded on the north by the Hindu Kush (it was known as such only in the medieval period) and on the east *by the great world-stream of ocean, which ran at no great distance beyond the Sind desert*, implying that there were no countries.
3. On the main Indian sub-continent, let alone the vast Far Eastern land-mass from China to Malaysia, *they knew nothing.*
4. In general Alexander's *ignorance of Indian geography remained profound.*
5. His whole eastern strategy *rested on a false assumption.*
6. When enlightenment came, *it was too late.*
7. The great Ganges Plain, by its mere existence, *shattered his dream more effectively than the army could have done.*

Therefore, the historians have made a frivolous attempt during 19<sup>th</sup> century to make Alexander invade India obviously to strengthen their invasion theory of colonized nations.

**The Nile and Nila Explode the Myth of Alexander's Invasion on India:** Alexander and Virgil considered and named Indus as Nile.

*"According to the geographical theories of the earliest Greeks, the "Prometheus Bound" is described as follows: This condition was fulfilled by the river Indus. Arrian (vi, I) mentions that Alexander the Great, when preparing to sail down the Indus 9having seen the crocodiles in the river Indus, and in no other river except the Nile.....), seemed to himself to have discovered the sources of the Nile; as though the Nile, rising from some place in India, and flowing through much desert land, and thereby losing its name Indus, next.....flowed through inhabited land, being now called Nile by the Ethiopians of those parts and afterwards by the Egyptians. Virgil in the 1vth George echoes the obsolete error",*

Blavatsky<sup>16</sup>, after giving these details notes that –

*"Alexander, who was better acquainted with Attock than with India – for he never entered India proper – could not have failed to hear the Indus near its sources, called Nil and Nila. The mistake – if mistake it is – is thus easily accounted for"*

The Greek cartographers have cleared showed that the world ends with Arabia during the material period. No two maps tally with each other in any detail. In fact, they



later start to identify India as *Indian extra-Gangem* and *India intra-Gangem*. Whereas, there were Greek scholars who considered India as a land of knowledge, wealth and so on, and thus, later even mentioned as paradise on the earth. But, because of the complexity, they started misrepresented the facts of India.

#### The Difference Between Greek and Indian Geographers:

Greek geographers and other experts made Alexander to believe that he had reached the end of the world, after he crossed Persia. But, Indian geographers, astronomers and cosmologists had clear idea about the world, existing countries and even Universe.

Sl. No.	Greek scholars	Indian scholars
1.	World was flat surrounded with oceanic waters.	World was round / globular with land and water.
2.	The existing world contained Greece, African and Middle east countries.	World contained seven continents with different countries and peoples.
3.	Considered other people as barbarians, uncivilized and so on.	The civilization of other peoples recognized and respected.
4.	Non-Greeks were described as men with two heads, three eyes, half-man-half-animal and so on.	No such description.
5.	Later, western scholars expurgated all such descriptions and made the writings to appear as reasonable, acceptable to modern mind.	Not subjected to such expurgation or expunction, but continued to be printed and circulated as such.

**The Creation of Alexander Romance:** The Alexander Romance has been the creation of medieval writers and later glorified by the Christian and Islamic apologists. They contain fairy tales making different countries inheriting Alexander to be their king, son and so on. He takes different forms visiting many countries performing miraculous acts. Particularly, the stories connecting him with India brings out the following details<sup>17</sup>:

1. India was the paradise of the earth. It contained enormous wealth.
2. India had many spiritual men, who were not afraid of him.
3. Alexander reached earthly paradise, but he was turned back at the gate, because only the just can

enter there! But he was given a mysterious ball, which turned into a eyeball warning him that he would go to earth as dust (According Babylonian Talmud story datable to 500 CE).

4. Alexander came to a great city on the banks of Ganges or Euphrates, which had a wall with one window. When he went there, an old man appeared. He asked for the tribute and the old man gave a stone of mystic meaning advising him that the city was the earthly paradise and home of the blessed (According to a 12<sup>th</sup> cent. German story).
5. Alexander took revenge against the Brahmins, as they critically injured him and killed his horse.
6. He was born of a snake in Egypt and flew to India to attack Brahmins.

Sl. No.	Origin of romance or myth	Details	Date or period assigned to	Attributed to	Language version
1	Egypt	The Egyptians reportedly claimed that he was the son of their last king Nectanebus II	c.200 BCE	Callisthenes, but Pseudo-Callisthenes	Greek
2.	-do-	-do-	3 <sup>rd</sup> cent.CE	-do-	Armenian
3.	Persia	It makes Alexander a Persian Prince	7 <sup>th</sup> century CE.		Syriac
4.	Arabia	He is identified with "the two horned"	12 <sup>th</sup> cent.CE	Koran	Arabic
5.	France	A poem by Albenc de Besancon	12 <sup>th</sup> cent.CE		French
6.	Germany	Story as briefed above.	c.1130	Lampiecht	German
7.	France		18 <sup>th</sup> cent.CE	Aleandre de Bernay	French

The above stories have certain truth, as vouchsafed by the Greek accounts:

1. Certain Indians were beating their feet on the ground and they explained the significance as follows: "O

king Alexander, each man possesses just so much of the earth as this on which we stand; and you being a man like other men, save that you are full of activity and relentless, are roaming over all this



earth far from your home troubled yourself, and troubling others. *But not so long hence you will die, and will possess just so much of the earth as suffices for your burial*" (According to Arrian).

2. *He hanged many Indian philosophers*, as they reviled him and encouraged the free states to revolt against him.
3. He also captured ten Indian sadhus or gymnophists and *executed them*, as they spoke against him. Before dying one of them replied for the query of Alexander as to why they induced other to revolt against him, as follows: *"Because I wished him to live with honour or die with honour"*.
4. This is similar to *the request of Porus*.

Alexander in his life had seen only killings, horrors of war and terror of death. But, here, he found people, who were not afraid of death. Who showed the way that swords could not do anything before them or conquer the hearts of people. However, he persecuted them, because of his frenzied zeal. He could not understand the meaning and power of non-violence and hence died on June 13, 323 within three years from the date of killing Indian spiritualists and philosophers.

Alexander destroyed the works of the Zoroaster, the founder of the Fire-temple of Azareksh<sup>18</sup>. He routed the Persian empire and destroyed the places of worship and thus, certain Muslim rulers regarded him as a model in carrying out their jihad against kafirs. Thus, Sikandar Lodhi (1488-1517), Sultan Sikandar the Idol Breaker of Kashmir (1386-1410), Sikandar Shah of Bengal and others assumed the titles of Alexander to imitate him! But, this archetype or myth started with 14<sup>th</sup> century in India.

**What was the Direct and Indirect Effect of Alexander's Invasion of India?** Vincent Arthur Smith<sup>19</sup> gives answer to this crucial question, which is reproduced as follows:

1. "Whatever Hellenistic elements in Indian civilization can be detected were all *indirect consequences* of Alexander's invasion. *The Greece influence never penetrated deeply*. Indian polity and structure of society resting on the caste basis remained substantially, unchanged, and even in military science *Indians showed no disposition to learn the lessons taught by the sharp sword of Alexander*" (emphasis added).
2. "Alexander's fierce campaign produced *no direct effects upon either the ideas or the institutions of India*. During his brief stay in the basin of the Indus, he was occupied almost solely with fighting. Presumably, he was remembered by the ordinary natives of the regions which he harried merely *as a demon-like outer barbarian who hanged Brahmins without scruple and won battles by impious methods in defiance of scriptures, Indians felt no desire to learn from such a person*" (emphasis added).

Smith has only corroborated the killings and violent inhumane crimes meted against Indian spiritualists and philosophers as pointed out. Thus, the guilty consciousness is revealed in the Alexander romance in later days.

**The Methodology Adapted and Adopted by the Greeks in the Alexander's Romance:** The Greek writers were having less information about India and they were writing imaginary descriptions about India. However, there were genuine visitors to India from Greece. They included Pythagoras (c.550 BCE), Plato (427-347 BCE), Apollonius and others. Scholars like Socrates were influenced by the Indian thought<sup>20</sup>. As they were reflecting Indian thought, they were persecuted, poisoned and killed. Others adapted and adopted to eulogize Greeks against Indians, thus, the Classical accounts, inspite of glorification of Alexander's exploits, contain some facts, because, Alexander killed innocent Indians and philosophers and sages against all moral principles. The guilty consciousness worked through the minds of the Greek writers and as well as the modern and western historiographers.

Jacob Burchhardt<sup>21</sup> succinctly assessed the mindset of them as follows:

*"Followers of Alexander pretended find these myths native to the orient in order to flatter him. They transformed the Caucasus from the north to the Eastern (Indian) ocean by the simple expedient of naming certain mountains in India "Caucasus" and showed him in the Paropamisus, a ridge of mountains to the north of India, a cave serving as a prison from which Herakles freed Prometheus. They flatteringly compared Alexander himself with Herakles by demonstrating that he had reached as far in his campaigns as Herakles had travelled."*

*"The Greeks reveal a falsifying trait by their forgeries and interpolations. It is highly characteristic that the very first epistle in the later Trojan legend is a forgery. Genealogies and documents were often unreliable: the works of Acusilaus, the ancient Ionic historian, were in their later form a notorious forgery. He supposedly derived them from bronze tablets his father had dug up. Laws and enactments of popular assemblies were casually forged; the latter are betrayed by the garulious motivations adduced like those of the Athenian resolution to honour Hippocrates."*

*"I we also consider the opposite of forgery, namely, the suppression of authentic dates and documents, we shall get an idea of the difficulties besetting the critical researcher everywhere. However, like Thucydides, sought what is true, first had to discriminate truth from poesy, second truth from falsification, at every step of the way. And finally, Greek historiography was weak in dealing with events long past but acquired fame in presenting contemporary or recent events"*.

Therefore, Indian researchers have to be careful in dealing with non-Indian source materials in dealing with Indian subjects. It is better to exhaust indigenous source materials and then cross check with non-Indian sources. Now, let us take up the issue of Archetypes of Greek Alexander and India Skanda.



### Archetypes of Greek Alexander and Indian

Skanda: With the available evidences, based on the above discussion, which archetype could be the ancient or original is analyzed now. In fixing and deciding the Archetype of anything, the chronology is very important. From the original, the replicas would have been made. Imitations and models would have been made from the primeval and not from the duplicates. In people related history, only archetypes are respected and glorified and not the imposed ones. That is why living tradition continues with tradition, while the imposed and proclaimed ones are neglected, forgotten or even thrown away, the moment the aggressors leave. The fact in India is that even the aggressors and aliens had assumed the local and indigenous titles to attract or acceptable to the people. The Muslim rulers and even the British adapted and adopted the tactics by minting coins with Indian Gods and Goddesses.

It is noted that the deification of Alexander could have taken place –

1. During the 4<sup>th</sup> century BCE: As Alexander (356-323 BCE) was reported to have declared that he should be considered as God, he might have been worshipped so by his followers or by others because of force and compulsion. However, it is noted that during his life time many not only questioned his claim, but also opposed him.
2. During the 1<sup>st</sup> centuries of the Current Era: With the developed contacts between India and Greece, if the Greeks could have exercised more influence on Indians, as has been claimed by the writers, then, there must have been Alexander temples found in the areas, where he adventured starting with Greece to India including the intervening areas.
3. During the medieval period with the rise of Alexander Romance: As the Alexander romance is exalted, at least during that period such transformation should have taken place.

But, the western scholars have not shown any evidences to that effect. During his lifetime itself, his proclaimed divinity was questioned and not accepted by many. No Alexander temples found or reported by the archaeologists. No idols of Alexander worshipped as God consecrated in temples. No rules or codification of rules for the making of idols of Alexander, consecration of such idols, worshipping, elaboration of connected rites, rituals and ceremonies etc., are found.

The sculptures, paintings etc., of him and the coins issued by him only prove his political entity existed during the material period. The over-glorification has been done only by the western scholars and later by the historiographers to justify their aggressive policies, colonial hypotheses and invasion theories in India. Moreover, the history, what they write or advocate to

write is not the people's history. That is why the people's history does not help or suit their historiographies.

In the case of Skanda / Karttikeya / Subramanya / Shanmuga / Guha / Muruga – the conceptualization and evolution of respective myths, development and crystallization leading to organized worship, supported indigenous literature, tradition, heritage. They are examined as follows:

1. Conceptualization and evolution of myth / Archetype: Conception, perception, idealization and crystallization of myth have been phased and clearly noted.
2. Conceptualization and evolution leading to development of myth / Archetype: Growth, spread and acceptance by people prove the Development, it is well supported by the Sanskrit and Tamil literature.
3. Indigenous literature containing such processes of conceptualization, evolution and development of myth / Archetype: Indigenous literature is available explaining the conceptualization, evolution and development of myth and leading to Archetype.
4. Local tradition about the existence of myth / Archetype: Very strong and established local tradition about the existence of myth. In fact, the Kumara / Kaumara myth of Vedic period (2500-1500 BCE) explains all the myths related to Skanda myth and archetype.
5. Living and continuous tradition about the myth / Archetype: Such local tradition is not only 5000 years old, but also continuous and continuing. The Skanda / Karttikeya / Subramanya / Shanmuga / Guha / Muruga / Velan as conceived, perceived and worshipped at that time is still worshipped as such.
6. Following of such living and continuous tradition about the myth / Archetype: The following is remarkable, as it has spread and spreading with them, wherever they gone or go.
7. Continuous following of ceremonies, rituals and rites connected with such myth / Archetype: The ceremonies, rituals and rites as followed before are still followed not only in India, but also in different parts of world even today.
8. Continuous deification of such Archetype: Deification has been continuous i.e, the God is not forgotten or abandoned one.
9. Codification and Canonization of Worship: Such rituals, rites and ceremonies connected with making Idols, consecration of idols, building temples etc., have been supported by Shilpa (the science of creation of Idols representing God) and Agama (the practical guide of worship of God) Shastras.



#### 10. Consistent With Believers Throughout the World:

As all factors considered are people related, they have been consistent, because, they are connected with culture, heritage, tradition and civilization, in spite of the difference in language and other factors.

These processes happened during the following periods:

1. Vedic period (2500-1500 BCE)
2. Post-Vedic and Pre-Epic period (1500-500 BCE).
3. Tamil Sangam / Tolkappiyam period (1000 BCE – 500 BCE or 500 BCE-300CE).
4. Epic period (first centuries of BCE and CE).

Thus, the Skanda myth and Archetype of India has been the ancient, autonomous, independent, autochthonous, indigenous, popular and Universe.

It is therefore concluded that in the case of Alexander, there is –

1. No or doubtful conceptualization and evolution of myth / Archetype.
2. No such conceptualization and evolution leading to development of myth / Archetype.
3. No indigenous literature containing such processes of conceptualization, evolution and development of myth / Archetype.
4. No local tradition about the existence of myth / Archetype.
5. No living and continuous tradition about the myth / Archetype.
6. No following of such living and continuous tradition about the myth / Archetype.
7. No continuous following of ceremonies, rituals and rites connected with such myth / Archetype.
8. No continuous deification of such Archetype.
9. No codification and canonization of worship.

**Conclusion:** Western historians accuse that Indians have no sense of history and they were very poor in recording historical events and so on. They even reject the Indian source materials, which are still available to the researchers. As pointed out above, the Greek classical accounts are available only from the secondary sources. They contain history and myth. They have been biased against India, because of the complex exhibited at different levels.

Alexander Romance, resurrected in the medieval period is a myth and not like the myth of Skanda / Kanda / Kartikeya / Muruga developed around c.2500 BCE based

on Sanskrit literature and c.1000 BCE based on Sangam literature. The origin of Skanda / Kanda is older than Alexander himself. It was conceived, evolved and developed in phased manner consisting with the people. Therefore, Alexander or the name or the Romance cannot be an archetype for Skanda / Kanda. Comparing or imposing laterday myth on the ancient myth is nothing but historical idiosyncrasy and fallacy.

#### Notes and References

1. Elphinstone, *History of India*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition, p.11.  
Fleet, *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Vol.II, "Epigraphy in Indian Empire", p.3,5,6.  
Vincent A. Smith, *Oxford History of India*, Clarendon Press, 1923.  
Max Mueller, *What India Can Teach Us?*, pp.3-8.
2. Vincent Arthur Smith, opt.cit.,  
Max Mueller, opt.cit.
3. John Bentley, *Hindu Astronomy*, Calcutta.  
James Ferguson, *On the Study of Indian Architecture*, London, 1867,  
Parta Mitter, *Much Maligned Monsters*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1977, London.  
4. P. K. Agrawala, *Skanda-Kartikeya*, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, 1967, p.xiv.  
He pointed out that - "At some early stages in the study of Indian thought, a view was hazarded that Skanda was nothing but a Sanskritization of the name Alexander. But how fantastic is this frivolous statement we need not comment upon it. That Skanda is not an intruded deification of Alexander is again clear from the Chandayoga Upanishad where he is identified with Sanatkumara. The date of the Upanishad is unanimously regarded earlier than the Greek invader by several centuries".
5. Patrick Harrigan, "*Skanda-Iskandar and the Alexander Romance : History and Diffusion of Mythic Archetypes*", Souvenir of the First International Conference Seminar on Skanda-Murukan, 1998, p.187.  
N. Gopala Pillai, "*Skanda: The Alexander Romance in India*", All India Oriental Conference, 1937.
6. Greene, *History of Greece*, U.K, 1943, p.473.
7. Fleet, *Epigraphica Indica*, Vol.II, Motilal Banarasidas, 1970, p.471.
8. G. Buhler, *Asoka's Rock Edicts*, in *Epigraphica Indica*, Vol.II, Motilal Banarasidas, 1970, p.471.
9. Ap. Dascalakis, *The Hellenism of the Ancient Macedonians*, Institute for Balkan Studies, 1965, Greece, p.65, 66.

10. Greene, opt.cit, p.404.
11. J. B. Bury, *History of Greece*, Macmillan & Co., U.K., p.821.
12. Mahaffy discusses in his "*Problems of Greek History*", 165, sqq. And Wilamowitz-Mollendorff in *Aristoteles and Athen*, 808, 1.40 (quoted by J.B. Bury, p.883).
13. J. B. Bury, opt.cit., p.828.
14. Encyclopedia Americana, The International Edition, Vol.I, 1998, p.540; The New Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol.13, p.226, Crolier Encyclopedia, Crompton's Encyclopedia etc.
15. E.A.W.Badge (Editor), *Ethiopic Texts*.
16. Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, Madras, 1975, Vol.III, p.416.
17. Richard Cavensidh, *Man, Myth and Magic*, New York, 1983, pp.1090-103.
18. Blavatsky, opt.cit., Vol.III, p.19.
19. Vincent A. Smith, *The Oxford History of India*, Clarendon Press, UK, 1923, p.87 and 139, quoted verbatim with emphasis added.
20. E. Migot, *Memoris Sur les anciens philosophes de l' Inde*, and *Memories de l' Academie Eroyal des Inscriptions et Belles*, Letters, XXXI, 1761,-63, pp.90-92.  
  
Richard Garbe, *India and Christendom*, The Open Court Publishing Co., La Sale, Illiones, 1959.  
  
E. Pocoke, *India in Greece*, Orient Publishers, New Delhi, 1976.
21. Jacob Burchhardt, *History of Greek Culture*, Constable Publishers, London.

K. V. Ramakrishna Rao, *The Myth of Deification of Alexander and its Alleged Influence on Skanda / Muruga/ Karttikeya*, in "The Antiquity of Worship of Skanda-Karttikeya-Subramanya," Bharatiya Itihasa Sankalana Samiti, Chennai, 2001, pp.29-36.